

Application of the Direct Microscopic Formalism to Nuclear Data Evaluation

F. B. Guimaraes

*Instituto de Estudos Avançados/DCTA,
12228-001 São José dos Campos, São Paulo, Brazil
e-mail: fbraga@ieav.cta.br*

Abstract

We review the basic definitions of the direct microscopic formalism (DMF) and the corresponding model code TRANSNU, to describe pre-equilibrium nuclear systems, as elements of the grand canonical ensemble. We analyze its inconsistencies, especially the impossibility of exact solution of the nuclear many-body problem, and propose solutions.

We use the strong dependence of pre-equilibrium emissions on the ratio of transition rates, in code TNG, to propose a redefinition of the parameters in the master equation, and obtain smoother excitation functions in the energy regions where different exciton classes contribute. We compare the transition rates of TRANSNU with the phenomenological ones for the estimation the excitation function of a few p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe , and obtain reasonable descriptions for activation energy, local maxima and average magnitude.

Despite the inconsistencies and a few remaining numerical problems, related with non meaningful noises in the strong oscillations of the TST, especially with the excitation energy and for low exciton number, we find the results of the present work very promising, indicating that the DMF can be used as a more precise and physically meaningful approach for the study of nuclear systems in pre-equilibrium than the traditional statistical models.

1. Introduction

The analysis of the pre-equilibrium phase of nuclear reactions (PE) is usually made by considering more or less approximate phenomenological formalisms, in which the microscopic description

is treated semi-classically, and statistical approximations are used to describe the parameters of the system.

One of the most common approaches is to consider the general *exciton* concept originally proposed by Griffin[1], to analyze nuclear states and particle emissions before the formation of the compound nucleus. This approach can be divided into two main semi-classical lines:[2] the *hybrid model* of Blann and Vonach and the *Standard Exciton Model* (EXM)[3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. As explained in Refs.[8, 9] both approaches have the same basic description of the evolution of the nuclear system at the PE stage, adopting the idea of a chain of increasingly complex systems generated by the residual interactions, in which the initial nuclear energy is more and more evenly shared by all excitable nuclear degrees of freedom.

The essential difference between these two semi-classical approaches is the opposite assumption about the level of configuration mixing of the evolving system at each step of the chain: the hybrid model assumes “no mixing” between the various “classes of excitons”, each class defining a level of “complexity”, while the EXM assumes “perfect mixing” between intra-class transitions, with or without particle emissions, i. e., that the energy is perfectly shared among the excitons at each step of the complexity chain and the occupation probabilities of all configurations or each class are the same.

In these models the nuclear “complexity” is then defined by the number of excited *single particle states* (sp-states) in comparison with the fundamental state, where the total nuclear excitation is zero and all component nucleons occupy the lowest possible energies levels up to a maximum called Fermi level, ϵ_F .

To describe the excited nuclear system one initially considers the fundamental state and the sp-states that can be possibly excited on it, and call these sp-states “holes” when created below ϵ_F or “particles” when created above it. In addition, the *initial sp-states above ϵ_F* are also defined as holes.

All these sets of “excitable” states are model dependent and, in particular, the number of holes above ϵ_F can be arbitrarily large. If at a given moment of the evolution of the nuclear system there are “ h ” holes “ p ” particles the total number

$$n = p + h \tag{1.1}$$

of excited sp-states is called the *exciton number* of the system. For nuclear states with excitation energy greater than zero, one assumes that new particles can be created only in states previously occupied by holes and, vice-versa, holes can be created only in states previously occupied by particles, corresponding to the “physical concept” of excitons.

In this work we follow the usual definition of Model Space[10, 11, 12, 6, 5] and expand the above concept to consider the more abstract or “mathematical concept” of particles and holes as two *independent fermion fields*, i. e., that can be created or destroyed independently, to permit a simpler algebraic definition of nuclear excited states and then add the physical constraint that a “particle” and a “hole” cannot be in the same state at the same time.

Therefore, we define independent sets of levels for the particle and hole fields and ϵ_F also as an independent phenomenological parameter of the model, related to the *depth* of the long range attracting nuclear potential. The interaction of the excited sp-states is usually defined by a phenomenological “residual potential”, or “mean *field*” added to the free part of the nuclear Hamiltonian, and the basis of sp-states can be defined self-consistently or by an *ad hoc* phenomenological function.

The resulting nuclear system is then, by definition, in a state of *quasi-equilibrium* (QE), i. e., its state changes can be described by first order perturbations over the free movement description, considered as in an “approximate state of equilibrium”. The latter is defined essentially by the mean-field itself, where a non disturbed equilibrium corresponds to zero mean-field.

To simplify the present analysis and permit a direct comparison with semi-classical studies, the basis adopted for the single particle wave-functions in this work is either the phenomenological Harmonic Oscillator basis (H.O.) or the approximated “constant spacing” basis, in which the spin-orbit splitting of the eigen-levels of the H.O. Hamiltonian is neglected, but the other quantum numbers and the eigenfunctions themselves of the H.O. basis are kept,[13] with an arbitrary constant interspacing between single particle states.

The connection with actual nuclear systems at the PE-stage is realized by assuming that the sp-energies cannot be greater than a given phenomenological maximum, which coincides with the maximum of the energy of the “hole” sp-states at the initial time, and that particles and holes can only be created or destroyed simultaneously, i. e., in pairs of particle-hole sp-states (ph-pairs). Then, the total number of excitons can only vary in steps of $\Delta n = \pm 2$ or be constant.

From a given initial excited state, for example by the absorption of an incident nucleon on a given target nucleus, the system is supposed to evolve by increasingly sharing the total excitation among the largest possible number of sp-states, increasing the number of excitons.

The sharing occurs at the microscopic level as a consequence of the residual interactions between sp-states and the increase of n is counterbalanced by possible PE emission of particles or annihilation of a ph-pairs. This produces an average systematic increase of number of excitons up to a maximum that defines the “most probable exciton number” at the PE stage, \tilde{n} , beyond which the system is supposed to evolve *preferably* towards full equilibrium (compound nucleus state)

instead of by emission of more particles at the PE stage.

In the EXM the rates of transition between nuclear states of increasing complexity are usually given in an essentially phenomenological way. In particular, the transition matrix elements, describing the residual mean-field, are considered as phenomenological *constants* or simple functions of the nuclear excitation energy, U , as exemplified in Ref.[14].

In addition, the EXM relies on approximations of statistical nature that may not be very precisely defined for nuclear systems at microscopic level, which often makes it difficult to evaluate the importance of the details of the microscopic interaction in the description of the PE process. For example, the semi-classical formulations[2, 3] give the density of states for a given U as a convolution of the densities for p and h , [6]

$$\omega_{ph}(U) = \int_0^U \omega_p(U)\omega_h(U-U)dU, \quad (1.2)$$

which can be deduced from the continuum approximation (*CAP*), but does not result directly from the quantum microscopic description.

The traditional approach to the Shell Model defines the moments of the Hamiltonian in terms of Laplace transforms and their inverse to obtain expressions like (1.2) for the nuclear density and in the microscopic description of Ref.[11] a similar approach is followed to obtain the expressions for the transition strengths.

In this work we use the *direct microscopic formalism* (DMF), and the corresponding model code TRANSNU, of Refs.[11, 10] in which one is able to produce the results of the Shell Model without effectively relying on the validity of *CAP* for nuclear levels and other common approximations of the semi-classical models.

In this respect the DMF is a more natural and appropriate description of nuclear transition strengths, bringing a complementary view to the usual statistical description of PE states.

One of the central aspects of the DMF is the proportionality of the degeneracy of a given nuclear state (with given total excitation energy, U , angular momentum, M , and number of excitons, p and h), $d(U, M, p, h)$, to the corresponding density of nuclear states

$$d(U, M, p, h) \propto \omega(U, M, p, h), \quad (1.3)$$

i. e., the quantization of $\omega(U, M, p, h)$, which permits to connect to the traditional approach, using *CAP*, and reinterpret the moments of the nuclear Hamiltonian, in this limit, in terms of usual convolutions over the excitation energy of the moments of less excited states in accordance with the general proposal of Ref.[11].

Throughout this paper we use the two letters “sp” to designate “single particle”.

In Sec.2 we present the basic formal definitions of the direct microscopic algebra,[11, 10] the definitions of the Shell Model and of the nuclear density in connection with the Darwin-Fowler statistics and the computation of the momenta of the nuclear Hamiltonian. We briefly review the importance of *CAP* and the grand canonical ensemble of Statistical Mechanics to connect with the Laplace transform, as it is done in the traditional statistical pre-equilibrium approaches, and how the DMF provides a more direct and physically meaningful way to describe the same systems.

In Sec.3 we review some aspects of the statistical phenomenological approaches that apply to the present discussion, especially in connection with code **TNG**’s definitions and use of transition rates during the pre-equilibrium stage, inspired by the original approach of Griffin.[1]

In Sec.4 we present the main results of this paper. We compare numerically the transition strengths of TRANSNU (TST) and transition rates (TR’s) of TNG and another independent EXM model and apply them to the estimate of the excitation function of a few *p*-induced reactions on ⁵⁶Fe.

We use the different designation of “TST” and “TR” for the parameters calculated by TRANSNU and the phenomenological models, respectively, throughout the paper despite the fact that these parameters are describing the same physical phenomenon, i. e. the rates of transition between classes of nuclear states during the PE stage, to reinforce the essentially different ways by which they are calculated in each case.

In Sec.5 we present a brief review of the main results of the paper and our evaluation of what we were able to obtain with TRANSNU and the DMF in the present work.

2. The Direct Microscopic Formalism

To make this presentation clearer and more self-contained we review in this section the basic results of the DMF defined in Ref.[11, 10].

The usual statistical description of the nuclear system inspired in the Shell Model,[5] can be defined as a limiting case of the “equidistant spacing model” as follows. The nuclear mass number is given by

$$A = \sum_{(i)} n_i , \quad (2.1)$$

where n_i are the occupation numbers of single particle states (sp-states) (satisfying: $n_i \in \{0, 1\}$) associated with the corresponding set of energies

$$\epsilon_i = \nu_i \epsilon , \quad (2.2)$$

where the ν_i are integers and ϵ is a fixed real number, defining a constant spacing between any two consecutive sp-levels of the approximate “equidistant spacing model”, but ϵ can also be considered as an average spacing of more realistic bases for the sp-states as e. g. the H.O. basis. The total nuclear energy is then given by

$$U = \mathcal{N} \epsilon = \sum_{(i)} n_i \nu_i \epsilon \quad (2.3)$$

and if k elements of the set $\{\nu_i, i = 1, \dots, \infty\}$ are equal, with $k > 1$, the corresponding elements,

$$\nu_{i1} = \dots = \nu_{ik} \in \{\nu_i, i = 1, \dots, \infty\} , \quad (2.4)$$

define the *set of degenerate sp-states* or the *energy level* (sp-level) to which these states belong

$$\epsilon_i = \nu_{i1} \epsilon = \dots = \nu_{ik} \epsilon . \quad (2.5)$$

A nuclear *configuration* (nuclear state) is defined as a set of bound sp-states of nucleons, characterized by the set of quantum numbers of each component sp-state. Then, the number of elements of the set of nuclear configurations associated with a *given nuclear energy* U is, by definition, the *degeneracy* of the corresponding *nuclear level*, $\mathcal{D}(U)$, characterized by U .

For given A and U , the nuclear degeneracy is equal to the number of solutions of the Eqs.2.1 and 2.3. Therefore, if one considers the microscopic distribution of nuclear states as a function of the nuclear energy, *the cumulative number of states increase in steps equal to the degeneracy of each nuclear level*.

If the sp-states are excitons, as defined at the Introduction, the particle and hole states may have energies conveniently defined with respect to ϵ_F and the nuclear energy will be equal to the *excitation energy*.

One should notice that in the microscopic description the *degeneracy of the sp-levels* is defined by the characteristic features of the nuclear Hamiltonian, i. e., by the set of nuclear forces and the symmetries of the nuclear system that define the resulting potential on each component nucleon and the consequent structure of sp-states.

On the other hand, due to the above definition of nuclear state, the *nuclear degeneracy* has a “combinatorial” meaning, in terms of the distribution of nucleons into the “pre-defined” structure of sp-states, resulting from the solution of the nuclear many-body problem.

In this context, if \mathcal{N} is the cumulative number of nuclear levels up to energy U , the nuclear level density in the continuous approximation (CAP) is given by[10]

$$\rho(U) = \frac{d\mathcal{N}}{dU} \approx \frac{\mathcal{D}_k(U)}{\epsilon} \quad (2.6)$$

or, using the Darwin-Fowler method, one may consider the generating function for the corresponding grand canonical ensemble, given by[5]

$$f(x, y) = \prod_i (1 + xy^{\nu_i}) = \prod_i (1 + x_i) , \quad (2.7)$$

where, i are the indices for sp-states as in (2.1) and (2.3) and x accounts only for the *number* of sp-states in each nuclear configuration, and is the same parameter for all sp-states. Both x and y have physical meaning under the statistical description of the grand canonical ensemble, but x has a more strictly combinatorial meaning while y is related with the probability distribution associated with the various microscopic systems of the ensemble.

Then, the nuclear level density can be directly defined, using the Cauchy theorem, as the value of the of the generating function at an adequate *pole* divided by ϵ ,[5]

$$\rho(A, U) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2 \epsilon} \oint \oint \frac{f(x, y) dx dy}{x^{A+1} y^{N+1}} , \quad (2.8)$$

while the generating function can be rewritten as

$$f(x, y) = 1 + x \sum_{(j)} y^{\nu_j} + x^2 \sum_{(j_1, j_2)} y^{(\nu_{j_1} + \nu_{j_2})} + \dots + x^A \sum_{(j_1, \dots, j_A)} y^{(\nu_{j_1} + \dots + \nu_{j_A})} + \dots . \quad (2.9)$$

Eq.(2.9)describes, for example, all nuclear systems with all possible “mass numbers” (number of sp-states in each “microcanonical state” or “microstate”) and energies (total energy of the microstate). In other words, each configuration of sp-states is also a microstate of the canonical ensemble with fixed mass number and temperature,[15] and the term proportional to x^A is the sum over all possible configurations with fixed nuclear mass A and variable energy. These canonical ensembles are the main focus of the DMF.

Equation (2.9) can be rewritten as

$$f(x, y) = 1 + x \sum_{(k1)} \mathcal{D}_{k1}(U_{k1}, 1) y^{\mathcal{N}_{k1}(1)} +$$

$$x^2 \sum_{(k2)} \mathcal{D}_{k2}(U_{k2}, 2) y^{\mathcal{N}_{k2}(2)} + \dots + x^A \sum_{(k)} \mathcal{D}_k(U_k, A) y^{\mathcal{N}_k(A)} + \dots + \quad (2.10)$$

where for each nuclear level, U_k , corresponds usually many different configurations of sp-states and for each A one has

$$\sum_{(j1, \dots, jA)} y^{(\nu_{j1} + \dots + \nu_{jA})} = \sum_{(k)} \mathcal{D}_k y^{\mathcal{N}_k} \quad (2.11)$$

where $\mathcal{D}_k = \mathcal{D}_k(U_k, A)$ is the degeneracy of the nuclear level U_k , and

$$\mathcal{N}_k = \sum_{i=1}^A \nu_{ki} = \frac{U_k}{\epsilon} . \quad (2.12)$$

In (2.10) different indices, $k1$, $k2$, etc., have been used for each term to reinforce the idea that the corresponding nuclear levels may not be the same. In these expressions the sum over k is equivalent to the sum over U_k , then $f(x, y)$ can be rewritten as a sum over nuclear levels,

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{(A, U)} \mathcal{D}(A, U) x^A y^{U/\epsilon} , \quad (2.13)$$

and also as a sum over *individual configurations*, with all degeneracies equal one,

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{(conf)} x^A y^{U/\epsilon} . \quad (2.14)$$

2.1 Expected values in the DMF

We consider here a given nuclear excited state, with variable mass number A and energy U , belonging to the corresponding grand canonical distribution defined over all nuclear configurations obtained as the solutions of the Eqs.(2.1) and (2.3).

One may always assume that the elements of the set of characteristic integers of the energies of sp-states, $\{\nu_i\}$ in (2.3), are ordered according to increasing values as a function of i and, by definition, there are only A nonzero elements in the set $\{n_i\}$.

Then the nuclear state, $|\psi_A\rangle$, can be represented by a product of A sp-states, which we assume to have constant energy as a function of the time t of the evolution of the system, so that each microstate is described by the independent particle model (IPM).[16, 17]

Then, $|\psi_A\rangle$ can be written as a linear combination, Slater determinant, of the corresponding complete set of eigenvectors of the single particle Hamiltonian. To simplify the presentation we consider only one term of the determinant to represent $|\psi_A\rangle$

$$|\psi_A\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^A |\psi_i(t)\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^A \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_i)} c_{i\mathbf{k}_i} e^{i\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_i} t/\hbar} |u_{\mathbf{k}_i}\rangle \quad (2.15)$$

$$= \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1)} \cdots \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_A)} c_{1\mathbf{k}_1} \cdots c_{A\mathbf{k}_A} e^{i(\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_1} + \cdots + \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}_A})t/\hbar} |u_{\mathbf{k}_1} \cdots u_{\mathbf{k}_A}\rangle, \quad (2.16)$$

where $\{u_{\mathbf{k}_1} \cdots u_{\mathbf{k}_A}\}$ is the basis of *sp*-states and (2.16) can be rewritten as

$$|\psi_A\rangle = \sum_{(j)} \mathcal{C}_j e^{iU_j t/\hbar} |\mathcal{W}_j\rangle \quad (2.17)$$

where j is a characteristic integer for the *nuclear energy*, corresponding to a specific sequence of the enumerable set of components of ψ_A . In this case we use the notation (j) to designate the corresponding degenerate set of nuclear configurations with energy U_j .

The grand canonical ensemble vector corresponding to the various nuclear states $|\psi_A\rangle$ can also be written[17] directly in terms of the *occupation numbers of all sp-states* defined in (2.3) as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{(n_1, \dots, n_\infty)} |n_1 \cdots n_\infty\rangle, \quad (2.18)$$

and if one defines the symbol “ $(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A)$ ” for the set of all configurations containing A and only A *sp*-states with non null occupations as

$$(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A) = \{\{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_A\}, /: n_{\mathbf{k}_1} = \cdots = n_{\mathbf{k}_A} = 1\}, \quad \text{for given } A, \quad (2.19)$$

where $\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_A$ are also supposed to be ordered by increasing values, then (2.18) can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{(\cdots, \mathbf{k}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{k}_A, \cdots)} |n_1, \dots, n_{\mathbf{k}_1}, \dots, n_{\mathbf{k}_A}, \dots, n_\infty\rangle = \sum_{(A)} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{k}_A)} |(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A)\rangle = \sum_{(A)} |\psi_A\rangle \quad (2.20)$$

The Fock space operator of an excited nuclear sytem that describes the corresponding grand canonical ensemble of nuclear states in terms of *excitons*, with (p) “particles” and (h) “holes” and arbitrary A , and has expected values over the states $|\psi\rangle$ given by (2.9) or (2.10) for each exciton type, can be defined, considering “ p ” and “ h ” as independent fermion fields, by the expression[11]

$$F_0 = \prod_{\mu\nu} (a_\nu a_\nu^\dagger + x_{p\nu} a_\nu^\dagger a_\nu) (b_\mu b_\mu^\dagger + x_{h\mu} b_\mu^\dagger b_\mu) = \prod_{\mu\nu} F_{p\nu} F_{h\mu}. \quad (2.21)$$

If one considers initially the simpler one fermion expression

$$F_0 = \prod_l (a_l a_l^\dagger + x_{pl} a_l^\dagger a_l), \quad (2.22)$$

it can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 &= \prod_{l=0}^{\infty} [(a_l a_l^\dagger) \cdots] + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \left[\prod_{\substack{(l_1, l_2) \\ \neq s}} (a_{l_1} a_{l_1}^\dagger) \cdots (a_s^\dagger a_s) \cdots (a_{l_2} a_{l_2}^\dagger) \cdots \right] x_{ps} \\ &+ \sum_{(s_1 < s_2)} \left[\prod_{\substack{(l_1, l_2, l_3) \\ \neq (s_1, s_2)}} (a_{l_1} a_{l_1}^\dagger) \cdots (a_{s_1}^\dagger a_{s_1}) \cdots (a_{l_2} a_{l_2}^\dagger) \cdots (a_{s_2}^\dagger a_{s_2}) \cdots (a_{l_3} a_{l_3}^\dagger) \cdots \right] x_{ps_1} x_{ps_2} \\ &+ \sum_{(s_1 < s_2 < s_3)} (\cdots) x_{ps_1} x_{ps_2} x_{ps_3} + \cdots \\ &= \sum_{(N=0)}^{\infty} \sum_{(s_N)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \Pi(s_N) \end{aligned} \quad (2.23)$$

where, for fixed N and configuration (s_N) , the Fock operator $\Pi(s_N)$ is given by

$$\Pi(s_N) = \prod_{\substack{(l_1, \dots, l_N, l_{N+1}) \\ \neq (s_1, \dots, s_N)}} (a_{l_1} a_{l_1}^\dagger) \cdots (a_{s_1}^\dagger a_{s_1}) \cdots (a_{l_N} a_{l_N}^\dagger) \cdots (a_{s_N}^\dagger a_{s_N}) \cdots (a_{l_{N+1}} a_{l_{N+1}}^\dagger) \cdots \quad (2.24)$$

with N terms of the type $(a_{s_j}^\dagger a_{s_j})$ among an infinite number of terms of the type $(a_{l_j} a_{l_j}^\dagger)$.

Then, it is clear that

$$\Pi(s_N) |(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A)\rangle = \delta_{N,A} \delta(s_1 \cdots s_N | \mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A) |(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A)\rangle \quad (2.25)$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} F_0 |\psi\rangle &= F_0 \sum_{(A)} |\psi_A\rangle \\ &= \sum_{(N)} \sum_{(s_N)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \Pi(s_N) \sum_{(A)} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_A)} |(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A)\rangle \\ &= \sum_{(N,A)} \sum_{(s_N)(\mathbf{k}_A)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \delta_{N,A} \delta(s_1 \cdots s_N | \mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A) |(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_A)\rangle = \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{(N,A)} \sum_{(s_N)(\mathbf{k}_A)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \delta_{N,A} \delta(s_N | \mathbf{k}_A) | \mathbf{k}_A \rangle = \\
&= \sum_{(N)} \sum_{(s_1 \cdots s_N)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) | (s_1 \cdots s_N) \rangle = \sum_{(N)} | \widetilde{\psi}_N \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

which, by comparison with (2.14) shows that F_0 projects the grand canonical ensemble vector $|\psi\rangle$ of Eq.(2.18) into another linear combination of its various components, where the coefficients have changed from 1 to

$$\left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right), \tag{2.27}$$

which are proportional (for given N) to the canonical ensemble *probabilities* to find the nuclear system in each of the component configurations $|s_1 \cdots s_N\rangle$. [15]

Eq.(2.26) also implies that for two given independent grand canonical vectors

$$\sum_{(1)} |1\rangle = \sum_{(N_1)} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_{N_1})} |(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdots \mathbf{k}_{N_1})\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{(2)} |2\rangle = \sum_{(N_2)} \sum_{(\mathbf{1}_{N_2})} |(\mathbf{1}_1 \cdots \mathbf{1}_{N_2})\rangle \tag{2.28}$$

results,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(1,2)} \langle 1 | F_0 | 2 \rangle &= \sum_{(1)} \langle 1 | \sum_{(N,N_2)} \sum_{(s_N, \mathbf{1}_{N_2})} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \delta_{N,N_2} \delta(s_N | \mathbf{1}_{N_2}) | \mathbf{1}_{N_2} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{(N_1, N, N_2)} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_{N_1}, s_N, \mathbf{1}_{N_2})} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \delta_{N,N_2} \delta(s_N | \mathbf{1}_{N_2}) \langle \mathbf{k}_{N_1} | \mathbf{1}_{N_2} \rangle \\
&= \sum_{(N_1, N, N_2)} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_{N_1}, s_N, \mathbf{1}_{N_2})} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \delta_{N,N_2} \delta_{N_1, N_2} \delta(s_N | \mathbf{1}_{N_2}) \delta(\mathbf{k}_{N_1} | \mathbf{1}_{N_2}) \\
&= \sum_{(N_1, N, N_2)} \sum_{(\mathbf{k}_{N_1}, s_N, \mathbf{1}_{N_2})} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) \langle \mathbf{k}_{N_1} | s_N \rangle \langle s_N | \mathbf{1}_{N_2} \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

therefore, F_0 is algebraically equivalent to the unitary projector weighted by the canonical probabilities of the microstates

$$F_0 \longleftrightarrow \sum_{(N, s_N)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^N x_{ps_j} \right) | s_N \rangle \langle s_N |. \tag{2.30}$$

Let O be an operator on the Fock space of the sp-states, which can modify the nuclear configuration. Then one can write the corresponding *transition strength*, defined as the square of the transition moment $\langle 1|O|2\rangle$ summed over all possible transitions (“trans.”), as[18]

$$S_O = \sum_{(trans.)} |O|^2 = \sum_{(1)} \langle 1|OO^\dagger|1\rangle = \sum_{(1,2)} |\langle 1|O|2\rangle|^2 = \sum_{(1,2)} \langle 1|O|2\rangle \langle 2|O^\dagger|1\rangle$$

due to possible variation in the number of excitons and nuclear excitation S_O must be redefined in the framework of the grand canonical ensemble using the grand canonical distribution, which can be written schematically as

$$\begin{aligned} |O|^2 &= \langle F_0 O F_0^\dagger O^\dagger \rangle = \sum_{(1)} \langle 1|F_0 O F_0^\dagger O^\dagger|1\rangle = \sum_{\substack{(1,2) \\ (3,4)}} \langle 1|F_0|2\rangle \langle 2|O|3\rangle \langle 3|F_0^\dagger|4\rangle \langle 4|O^\dagger|1\rangle \\ &= \sum_{(N)} \sum_{(s_N)} \left(\prod_j^N x_{ps_j} \right) \langle s_N|O|r_M\rangle \sum_{(M)} \sum_{(r_M)} \left(\prod_k^M x'_{pr_k} \right) \langle r_M|O^\dagger|s_N\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

In the case of two Fermion fields (e. g., “particles” and “holes”) F_0 is given by Eq.(2.21)

$$F_0 = F_p F_h = \prod_{\mu} \left(a_{\mu} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} + x_{p\mu} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} a_{\mu} \right) \prod_{\nu} \left(b_{\nu} b_{\nu}^{\dagger} + x_{h\nu} b_{\nu}^{\dagger} b_{\nu} \right), \quad (2.32)$$

which can be rewritten, as we saw in (2.21), as

$$F_p = \sum_{p=0}^{\infty} \sum_{(s_p)} \left(\prod_{k=1}^p x_{ps_k} \right) \Pi(s_p) \quad (2.33)$$

and

$$F_h = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \sum_{(r_h)} \left(\prod_{j=1}^h x_{hr_j} \right) \Pi(r_h) \quad (2.34)$$

and, due to the properties of the single particle fermion operators, see (2.26) and (2.30), one can also identify $\Pi(s_p)$ and $\Pi(r_h)$ with the components of the respective projection operator,

$$\Pi(s_p) = |s_p\rangle\langle s_p| \quad \text{and} \quad \Pi(r_h) = |r_h\rangle\langle r_h| \quad (2.35)$$

and

$$\Pi(s_p)\Pi(r_h) = |s_p r_h\rangle\langle s_p r_h|. \quad (2.36)$$

Then the analogous of (2.29) becomes,

$$\sum_{(1,2)} \langle 1 | F_p F_h | 2 \rangle = \sum_{(1,2)} \langle 1 | \sum_{(ph)(s_p r_h)} \left(\prod_{k,j=1}^{ph} x_{ps_k} x_{hr_j} \right) \delta(s_p r_h | 2) | (s_p r_h) \rangle \quad (2.37)$$

$$= \sum_{(1,2)} \sum_{(ph)(s_p r_h)} \left(\prod_{k,j=1}^{ph} x_{ps_k} x_{hr_j} \right) \delta(s_p r_h | 1) \delta(s_p r_h | 2) \quad (2.38)$$

and

$$\sum_{(1,2)} \langle 1 | F'_p F'_h | 2 \rangle = \sum_{(1,2)} \langle 1 | \sum_{(p'h')(s_{p'} r_{h'})} \left(\prod_{l,i=1}^{p'h'} x'_{ps_l} x'_{hr_i} \right) \delta(s_{p'} r_{h'} | 2) | (s_{p'} r_{h'}) \rangle \quad (2.39)$$

$$= \sum_{(1,2)} \sum_{(p'h')(s_{p'} r_{h'})} \left(\prod_{l,i=1}^{p'h'} x'_{ps_l} x'_{hr_i} \right) \delta(s_{p'} r_{h'} | 1) \delta(s_{p'} r_{h'} | 2) \quad (2.40)$$

and the analogous of (2.30) and (2.31) are

$$\langle F_p F_h O F'_p F'_h O^\dagger \rangle = \sum_{(1)} \langle 1 | F_p F_h O F'_p F'_h O^\dagger | 1 \rangle \quad (2.41)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{(12) \\ (34)}} \langle 1 | F_p F_h | 2 \rangle \langle 2 | O | 3 \rangle \langle 3 | F'_p F'_h | 4 \rangle \langle 4 | O^\dagger | 1 \rangle \quad (2.42)$$

$$= \sum_{(ph)(s_p r_h)} \left(\prod_{k,j=1}^{ph} x_{ps_k} x_{hr_j} \right) \langle s_p r_h | O | s_{p'} r_{h'} \rangle \sum_{(p'h')(s_{p'} r_{h'})} \left(\prod_{l,i=1}^{p'h'} x'_{ps_l} x'_{hr_i} \right) \langle s_{p'} r_{h'} | O^\dagger | s_p r_h \rangle \quad (2.43)$$

which can be rewritten as

$$\langle F_p F_h O F'_p F'_h O^\dagger \rangle = \sum_{\substack{(ph) \\ (p'h')}} \sum_{\substack{(s_p r_h) \\ (s_{p'} r_{h'})}} \left(\prod_{k,j=1l,i=1}^{ph} \prod_{p'h'} x_{ps_k} x_{hr_j} x'_{ps_l} x'_{hr_i} \right) \langle s_p r_h | O | s_{p'} r_{h'} \rangle \langle s_{p'} r_{h'} | O^\dagger | s_p r_h \rangle \quad (2.44)$$

Now we make the usual change of variables that defines the explicit connection with the microscopic statistical parameters of the sp-states and also opens the possibility of the Laplace transform interpretation

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{ps_k} &= x e^{(-\beta\epsilon_{s_k} - \gamma m_{s_k})} \\
x'_{ps_l} &= x' e^{(-\beta'\epsilon_{s_l} - \gamma' m_{s_1})} \\
x_{hr_j} &= y e^{(-\beta\epsilon_{r_j} - \gamma m_{r_j})} \\
x'_{hr_i} &= y' e^{(-\beta'\epsilon_{r_i} - \gamma' m_{r_i})}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.45}$$

then (2.44) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{\binom{ph}{p'h'}} x^p x'^{p'} y^h y'^{h'} \sum_{\binom{sp'r_h}{s_p'r_{h'}}} \left(\prod_{k,j=1}^{ph} \prod_{i=1}^{p'h'} e^{(-\beta\epsilon_{s_k} - \gamma m_{s_k})} e^{(-\beta\epsilon_{r_j} - \gamma m_{r_j})} e^{(-\beta'\epsilon_{s_l} - \gamma' m_{s_1})} e^{(-\beta'\epsilon_{r_i} - \gamma' m_{r_i})} \right) \\
&\quad \langle s_p r_h | O | s_{p'} r_{h'} \rangle \langle s_{p'} r_{h'} | O^\dagger | s_p r_h \rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

or

$$\langle F_p F_h O F_p' F_h' O^\dagger \rangle = \sum_{\binom{ph}{p'h'}} x^p x'^{p'} y^h y'^{h'} \sum_{\binom{sp'r_h}{s_p'r_{h'}}} e^{-\beta U - \gamma M - \beta' U' - \gamma' M'} \langle s_p r_h | O | s_{p'} r_{h'} \rangle \langle s_{p'} r_{h'} | O^\dagger | s_p r_h \rangle \tag{2.47}$$

where

$$U = \sum_{(k,j=1)}^{ph} \epsilon_{s_k} + \epsilon_{r_j} \quad \text{and} \quad M = \sum_{(k,j=1)}^{ph} m_{s_k} + m_{r_j} \tag{2.48}$$

$$U' = \sum_{(l,i=1)}^{p'h'} \epsilon_{s_l} + \epsilon_{r_i} \quad \text{and} \quad M' = \sum_{(l,i=1)}^{p'h'} m_{s_1} + m_{r_i} \tag{2.49}$$

As a shorthand practical notation that includes the essential features of the above expressions one may define

$$\langle F_p F_h O F_p' F_h' O^\dagger \rangle = (O | O^\dagger) = \sum_{(12)(UM)} \langle s_p r_h | O | s_{p'} r_{h'} \rangle \langle s_{p'} r_{h'} | O^\dagger | s_p r_h \rangle \tag{2.50}$$

$$= \sum_{(1)} \sum_{(2)} e^{[UM]} \langle s_p r_h | O | s_{p'} r_{h'} \rangle \langle s_{p'} r_{h'} | O^\dagger | s_p r_h \rangle \quad (2.51)$$

where

$$\sum_{(1)} = \sum_{\binom{ph}{p'h'}} x^p x^{p'} y^h y^{h'} \quad (2.52)$$

represents the sum over all possible numbers of excitons and

$$\sum_{(2)} = \sum_{\binom{s_p r_h}{s_{p'} r_{h'}}} \quad (2.53)$$

represents the sum over all configurations for given exciton number and

$$e^{[UM]} = e^{-\beta U - \gamma M - \beta' U' - \gamma' M'} \quad (2.54)$$

which is the non normalized grand canonical distribution function.

At last one may just drop the s 's and r 's and write

$$\langle F_p F_h O F_{p'} F_{h'} O^\dagger \rangle = \langle O | O^\dagger \rangle = \sum_{(12)} e^{[UM]} \langle ph | O | p'h' \rangle \langle p'h' | O^\dagger | ph \rangle, \quad (2.55)$$

which now has a precise meaning, where $|p, h\rangle$, $|p', h'\rangle$ represent the *possible nuclear configurations for given exciton numbers* “ p, h ” and “ p', h' ”.

In the case of the simple expected values (or “first order momentum”) of O the expressions are totally analogous,

$$\langle F_p F_h O \rangle = \langle O \rangle = \sum_{(12)(UM)} \langle s_p r_h | O | s_p r_h \rangle = \sum_{(12)} e^{[UM]} \langle s_p r_h | O | s_p r_h \rangle \quad (2.56)$$

with the two sums given by

$$\sum_{(1)} = \sum_{(ph)} x^p y^h \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{(2)} = \sum_{(s_p r_h)} \quad (2.57)$$

and

$$e^{[UM]} = e^{-\beta U - \gamma M} \quad (2.58)$$

Again one may drop the s 's and r 's to obtain the simplified expression

$$\langle O \rangle = \sum_{(12)} e^{[UM]} \langle ph | O | ph \rangle \quad (2.59)$$

Now, it is clear that the application of *CAP* to the set of nuclear levels ($U \approx \text{continuous}$) on Eq. (2.52) will correspond to a very large *number of levels* per unit energy on \sum_2 and permit the approximate replacement of the sum by an integral. The details of this procedure, its interpretation and some consequences are analyzed next.

2.2 The connection with the Laplace transform

The nuclear excitation, U , is a parameter that varies in a region defined by two finite extremes

$$U_{\min} \leq U \leq U_{\max} \quad (2.60)$$

where it takes a sequence of discrete values with degeneracy $\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)$, as defined in the last section, with A interpreted as the total number of excitons, $A=n=p+h$. Similarly the total nuclear angular momentum projection also varies in a stepwise manner between M_{\min} and M_{\max} as does any *additive quantum number* of the nuclear system. The following analysis is valid for these parameters, which correspond to the extensive thermodynamic properties of the system.

For given numbers (p,h) there is in general a subset of the set $(s_p r_h)$, of all nuclear configurations associated with (p,h) , for which the quantum numbers (U,M) take the same values and, by definition, the number of elements of this subset is equal to the degeneracy of the corresponding nuclear state,

$$\{(s_p)_i, (r_h)_i\} = \{\{s_1, \dots, s_p, r_1, \dots, r_h\}_i, i \in \{1, \dots, \mathcal{D}(A, U, M)\}\}. \quad (2.61)$$

Then, for example, one can rewrite Eq.(2.56) as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle F_p F_h O \rangle &= \sum_{(12)} e^{[UM]} \langle s_p r_h | O | s_p r_h \rangle \\ &= \sum_{(1)} \sum_{M=M_{\min}}^{M_{\max}} \sum_{U=U_{\min}}^{U_{\max}} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)} e^{[UM]} \langle (s_p)_i (r_h)_i | O | (s_p)_i (r_h)_i \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (2.62)$$

The cumulative number of nuclear states can be very high even for not very high excitations, as indicated by phenomenological calculations of nuclear level densities.[19] Then, if the density is also high, it is reasonable to use of *CAP* to replace the sum over U by an integral in (2.62) and one can explore this possibility using an *ad hoc* definition of nuclear density, inspired by the analysis at the beginning of this section.

Note that for each discrete U in the sum in the RHS of (2.62) there are $\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)$ states with the same energy and angular momentum, for which $e^{[UM]}$ has the same value. Then, if $\delta U=(U - U_{prev})$ is the variation of the nuclear excitation between its present and “previous value” in the sequence of the discrete set to which U belongs, the corresponding approximate nuclear density for each index i on the last sum of the RHS of (2.62) will be

$$\omega(A, U, M) \approx \mathcal{D}(A, U, M)/\delta U \approx \text{constant},$$

and

$$\mathcal{D}(A, U, M) = \sum_{(i=1)}^{\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)} (1) \approx \omega(A, U, M)\delta U = \int_{U_{prev}}^U \omega(A, U, M)(1)dU. \quad (2.63)$$

Then, replacing “(1)” by an arbitrary integrable function “(...)” and summing over all U gives,

$$\sum_{(U=U_{min})}^{U_{max}} \sum_{(i=1)}^{\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)} (...) \approx \int_{U=U_{min}}^{U_{max}} \omega(A, U, M)(...)dU. \quad (2.64)$$

and the sum over configurations with given a number of excitons in (2.62) becomes

$$\sum_{M=M_{min}}^{M_{max}} \sum_{U=U_{min}}^{U_{max}} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)} e^{[UM]} \approx \int_{U=U_{min}}^{U_{max}} e^{-\beta U} \left(\sum_{(M=M_{min})}^{M_{max}} \omega(A, U, M)e^{-\gamma M} \right) dU \quad (2.65)$$

where the definition (2.58) for $e^{[UM]}$ was used.

Now, for the nuclear excitation energies the minimum is the ground state, corresponding to $U_{min}=0$, and the maximum is unbounded and one can take,[6]

$$U_{max} \approx \infty, \text{ with good approximation,} \quad (2.66)$$

if the contribution for energies above U_{max} can be neglected. In this case, (2.65) becomes the Laplace transform of the part of the integrand inside the parenthesis.

More generally, one can rewrite (2.62), without *CAP*, as

$$\langle F_p F_h O \rangle = \sum_{(1)} \sum_{(M=M_{min})}^{M_{max}} \sum_{(U=0)}^{\infty} \sum_{(\alpha)} e^{[UM]} d_{\alpha}(p, h, U, M) \langle O \rangle_{\alpha}(p, h, U, M) \quad (2.67)$$

where α indicates all configurations for which “ $\langle phUM|O|phUM \rangle$ ” has the same value, i. e., the configurations *degenerated* with respect to the action of O or the observation of the physical quantity represented by O , therefore with the same expected value $\langle O \rangle_\alpha$, and “ $d_\alpha(p, h, U, M)$ ” is the corresponding degeneracy of states, with sum *exactly* equal to $\mathcal{D}(A, U, M)$

$$\sum_{(\alpha)} d_\alpha(A, U, M) = \mathcal{D}(A, U, M) . \quad (2.68)$$

The important point of expression (2.67) is that it can already be used for numerical calculations, but the statistical models prefer to employ the approximated Laplace transform formalism, *as if it was equivalent* to the direct microscopic description.

Similarly to (2.65), Eq.(2.67) can be approximated, using *CAP*, as

$$\langle F_p F_h O \rangle \approx \sum_{(1)} \sum_{(M=M_{min})}^{M_{max}} \int_0^\infty dU e^{-\beta U - \gamma M} \sum_{(\alpha)} \omega_\alpha(p, h, U, M) \langle O \rangle_\alpha(p, h, U, M) \quad (2.69)$$

where the nuclear density is defined as

$$\omega_\alpha(A, U, M) \approx d_\alpha(p, h, U, M) / \delta U \approx \text{constant},$$

for each α , and one can rewrite

$$d_\alpha(p, h, U, M) \approx \omega_\alpha(A, U, M) \times (U - U_{prev}) \approx \omega_\alpha(p, h, U, M) \delta U , \quad (2.70)$$

corresponding to the replacement of discrete degeneracy d_α by continuous level density ω_α and, for given number of excitons (p, h) , one has

$$\sum_{(M=M_{min})}^{M_{max}} \int_0^\infty dU e^{-\beta U - \gamma M} \sum_{(\alpha)} \omega_\alpha(p, h, U, M) \langle O \rangle_\alpha(p, h, U, M) . \quad (2.71)$$

Therefore, by definition,

$$\langle F_p F_h O \rangle \approx \mathcal{L} \left\{ \sum_{(M=M_{min})}^{M_{max}} e^{-\gamma M} \sum_{(\alpha)} \omega_\alpha(p, h, U, M) \langle p h U M | O | p h U M \rangle_\alpha \right\} , \quad (2.72)$$

where the symbol $\mathcal{L}\{X\}$ indicates the Laplace transform of (X) .

In particular, in the simplest case of the identity operator, $O=1$, all expected values are equal “1” and $\langle F_p F_h \rangle$ becomes essentially the Laplace transform of the state density, then

$$\sum_{(M=M_{min})}^{M_{max}} e^{-\gamma M} \omega(p, h, U, M) \approx \mathcal{L}^{-1}\{\langle F_p F_h \rangle\} = \mathcal{L}^{-1}\left\{ \prod_{\mu} (1 + x_{p\mu}) \prod_{\nu} (1 + x_{h\nu}) \right\}. \quad (2.73)$$

This result is *equivalent* to the traditional one of (2.8), if one includes the angular momentum projections in the definition of the integration variable y as in (2.45), because the RHS of Eq.(2.8) can be interpreted, using *CAP*, as the *inverse* Laplace transform of the grand canonical generating function.[6, 5]

On the other hand, one must notice that, in general, (2.8) is *not* equivalent to $\mathcal{L}^{-1}\{\langle F_p F_h \rangle\}$, that is, the traditional definition of (2.8) and the use of the Laplace transform for the description of the physical observation of O is approximate, while Eq.(2.62) is exact, assuming the grand canonical description of nuclear states with microstates constrained only by the IPM (Eq.(2.15)).

In addition, we have shown above that the microscopic formalism directly yields the desired expressions corresponding to *the inverse* of the Laplace transform of the expected values of the interacting operators, in terms of $\langle O \rangle_{\alpha}$ and the corresponding density of “final available states” (i. e., the physically allowed final states associated with the “observation” or “measurement” of O), *without having to actually evaluate them*.

Therefore, the straightforward and natural results of the DMF are obscured by the approximate, non necessary, intricate and microscopically imprecise traditional formalism of the Laplace transform, which should be avoided in PE calculations. More reasons to avoid the Laplace transform formalism are given in Ref.[10].

2.3 Discrete functions of the configurations

Regarding the idea of nuclear degeneracy, one notices that in (2.62) all the expected values

$$\langle (s_p)_i (r_h)_i | O | (s_p)_i (r_h)_i \rangle$$

correspond to configurations with energy U and total degeneracy $\mathcal{D}(A, U, M)$, which we will designate by (u)

$$(u) = \{(s_{pi}, r_{ri}); i = 1, \mathcal{D}(A, U, M)\}, \quad (2.74)$$

with $A=n=p+h$ and given M .

If the operator O describes, for example, the measurement of the *intrinsic spin* of the nuclear state it will have in general a sequence of different *discrete values* for the different elements of (u) and the expected values, $\langle O \rangle$, will also be degenerated, i. e., in general there will be more than one configuration for each value of the total spin. Then, one may write

$$\sum_{\substack{(u) \\ (conf)}} \langle O \rangle_u = \sum_{(i=1)}^{\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)} \langle (s_p)_i (r_h)_i | O | (s_p)_i (r_h)_i \rangle = \sum_{(i=1)}^{\mathcal{D}(A,U,M)} \langle O \rangle_i = \sum_{\substack{\beta=1 \\ (spins)}}^{\beta_{max}} \langle O \rangle_\beta d_\beta(A, U, M) \quad (2.75)$$

where $\{\beta = 1, \dots, \beta_{max}\}$ is a sequence of *integers* in biunivocal (one to one) correspondence with the discrete set of “spin values” $\{\langle O \rangle_\beta\}_\beta$ and $d_\beta(A, U, M)$ is the “spin degeneracy” satisfying,

$$\sum_{(\beta)}^{\beta_{max}} d_\beta(A, U, M) = \mathcal{D}(A, U, M) \quad (2.76)$$

This idea can be straightforwardly generalized to the “measurement” of a quantity that changes the total number of excitons, $A=n=(p+h)$, for example: $O=\sum_{(\alpha)} O_\alpha a_\alpha^\dagger a_\alpha$, where “ α ” indicates an exciton state of “particle” type. Then, the expected values in (2.62) would select all configurations in (u) , Eq.(2.74), that have one sp-state “ α ” in them.

The number of configurations for which the destruction of an sp-state “ α ” has non null expected value, define the degeneracy of nuclear states containing “ α ”. If this number is designated by $d_\alpha(A, U, M)$, the resulting set of nuclear configurations after the “observation” of a_α , the *intermediary state*, would have *the same degeneracy*, but the corresponding grid of nuclear energies and angular momenta would be displaced by ϵ_α and m_α respectively, therefore

$$d_\alpha(A - 1, U - \epsilon_\alpha, M - m_\alpha) = d_\alpha(A, U, M) . \quad (2.77)$$

In this context the introduction of *CAP* naturally brings the idea of convolution between states of different levels of “complexity” (number of excitons) during the PE-stage as it transforms sums of discrete sets of expected values times the respective degeneracies, Eq.(2.75), into integrals involving the corresponding nuclear densities.

Notice though that this connection with the idea of convolution is somewhat artificial, as it is not related with any actual physical connection between configurations with different number of excitons.

The result of Eq.(2.77) is only an aspect of the combinatorial relation between the different sets of configurations, where a sp-state is “selected” by the microscopic interactions in the set of

configurations with greater number of excitons, producing a new set that happens to have the *same number* of components, in which the selected sp-state is not present. Therefore, it is important to notice that the connection between the two sets of configurations in Eq. (2.77) is exclusively numerical, not physical.

The sums and integrals have ranges defined by the *available states*, i. e. the states that give non zero expected value for the measured quantity. For example, in (2.70) the density $\omega_\alpha(A,U,M)$ corresponds to available nuclear states associated with the operation or measurement of O , among the set of microstates with given A , U and M .

On the other hand, the set of configurations for each sp-state “ α ” is not directly connected with the nuclear excitation energy, but if the density of states is high all configurations with energies between two given energies, U and U_{prev} , can be considered as approximately having “energy U ” and the variation over α can be associated with densities corresponding to U .

In particular, when one sums over an sp-state “ α ” the previous discussion shows that it could have some degeneracy and, therefore, it is not equivalent to the sum over ϵ_α . This idea is further developed in Ref.[10] where the sum over ϵ_α is reduced to a convolution of nuclear densities, i. e., the sp-energies have an *associated density* that, in the *CAP* limit, naturally defines a convolution with the nuclear density that appears in the expression of the expected values.

Notice that the sum over the total nuclear spin projection M , and the corresponding sums over single particle angular momenta, m_α , *cannot* be transformed in the same way as U and ϵ_α , using *CAP*, because the interval between successive values of M or m_α is never smaller than 0.5 and therefore it cannot be considered as an infinitesimal even for a large number of configurations.

In Sec.4 we apply of the above formalism for the calculation of the transition strengths (TS) of the PE nuclear Hamiltonian and for estimation of p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe .

3. Phenomenological Statistical description

A complementary description to the one presented in the previous section is the phenomenological statistical description of PE-states[4, 5, 6, 12] and the EXM,[14, 20] that forms the theoretical basis of the nuclear data model code **TNG**.[19]

This model describes the particles in the excited nucleus as belonging to a degenerated Fermi gas, moving semi-classically, nearly independently of each other, and belonging to highly degenerated nuclear levels with small interspacing between them, under the action of an average

potential of residual interactions (“mean field”), similarly to a system of rigid macroscopic objects that continuously collide until one or more are eventually “emitted” from the system, corresponding to the nuclear decay. Only n , p and α particle emissions are considered in the **TNG** code.

Any excited particle can escape at any time, but is also subjected to quantum kinematic constraints defined by the barrier of the attractive mean field potential and the exclusion principle for fermions that may preclude emission. Then, the excited nuclear state can be characterized at any time by its quasi-equilibrium set of configurations of excitons (QE state), that is the state in which all configurations at each stage of the increasing complexity chain, i. e. for given (n, U) , have equal probability of occurrence.

The QE hypothesis is criticized in the work of Pompeia and Carlson[8] and found unnecessary. They suggest the replacement of the EXM by a more general “natural model”, but the results of the DMF presented in this paper could invalidate this conclusion to some extent, as we will see in the next section.

When the excitation energy of the residual nuclide is too low to permit more PE emissions the pre-equilibrium calculations stop and the residual nucleus is considered to be at the final “equilibrium” state, or *compound nucleus* state (CN). The CN is then described by the nuclear liquid drop model for the remaining de-excitation process, called the “evaporation” stage (EVAP).[21, 22]

The temporal evolution of the QE state as a function of the nuclear excitation energy, U , from an initial state $|n_i, U\rangle$ to a final $|n_f, U\rangle$, is described by the total transition probability per unit time or transition rate (TR), $\lambda(n_i, n_f, U)$.

If one assumes that the residual potential, $V(U)$, does not change importantly during the transition, that $|n_i, U\rangle$ and $|n_f, U\rangle$ are stationary and described approximately by the eigen-vectors of the unperturbed Hamiltonian, and that the density of final states is sufficiently high, then $\lambda(n_i, n_f, U)$ can be estimated using Fermi’s golden rule,[3]

$$\lambda(n_i, n_f, U) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \int |\langle n_f | V(U') | n_i \rangle|^2 \delta(U' - U) \omega(n_f, U') dU', \quad (3.1)$$

where $\omega(n_f, U')$ is the density of final nuclear states with energy U' and exciton number n_f . The single particle states and the residual potential are usually defined self-consistently and the final states are assumed to be obtained from the initial ones exclusively through two-particle transitions, i. e., $\Delta n=0$ or $\Delta n=\pm 2$.

If $|n, U, t\rangle$ is a given configuration of sp-states (nuclear state) with n excitons and excitation U at the time t , then it belongs to a *class of nuclear states* defined by $\{n, U\}$, usually called an “exciton class” because U is supposed to be constant between particle emissions, even if n varies.

Then, denoting by $P(n,U,t)$ the probability to find the nuclear system in the state $|n,U,t\rangle$, the time evolution of $P(n,U,t)$ is governed by a master equation given explicitly in terms of the different exciton transitions and possible particle emissions as,

$$\frac{dP(n,U,t)}{dt} = \sum_{(\nu)} \frac{dP_{\nu}(n,U,t)}{dt}. \quad (3.2)$$

where ν indicates the different types of emitted particle and an independent master equation is defined for the probability associated with each possible emission, in agreement with the basic assumptions of the original EXM theory of Miller *et.al.*[1, 8],

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dP_{\nu}(n,U,t)}{dt} = & \left[P_{\nu}(n-2,U,t) \left(\frac{p-1}{p} \right) + \frac{f_{\nu}(p)}{p} P(n-2,U,t) \right] \lambda_{+}(n-2,n,U) \\ & + \lambda_0(n,n,U,t) P_{\nu}(n,n,U,t) + \lambda_{-}(n+2,n,U,t) P_{\nu}(n+2,n,U,t) \\ & - P_{\nu}(n,U,t) \left[\Lambda(n,U) + \int_{V_{\nu}^c}^{U-B_{\nu}} \lambda_{\nu}^c(n,U,\epsilon_{\nu}) d\epsilon_{\nu} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where p is the number of particles, $\Lambda(n,U)$ is the total transition rate for nuclear states belonging to a given exciton class $\{n,U\}$, summed over all possible inter-class transitions, from $|n',U\rangle$ to $|n,U\rangle$,

$$\Lambda(n,U) = \sum_{(n')} \lambda_{\Delta n}(n,n',U), \quad (3.4)$$

B_{ν} is the binding energy of the emitted particle in the compound nucleus and V_{ν}^c is the Coulomb barrier before the emission. In **TNG** the terms in λ_0 are neglected in (3.3) and (3.4), corresponding to the hypothesis of attainment of “perfect equilibrium” for each exciton class of the PE process, or the IPM description in each class. This corresponds to the assumption that, for given $\{n,U\}$, single particle transitions *do not* happen and all nuclear configurations have the same probability, which are usual EXM hypotheses.

In (3.3), the transition rates are usually given by an approximated form of (3.1)

$$\lambda_{\Delta n}(n_i + \Delta n, n_i, U) = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} |M|^2 \omega_{\Delta n}(n_i + \Delta n, U) \quad (3.5)$$

where n_i is the initial exciton number, $\Delta n=0,\pm 2$, and $|M|$ is a phenomenological average absolute value for the interacting potential, or nuclear mean-field, supposed independent of U and the type of transition. The explicit expression for the state density is given by [8, 23]

$$\omega(p,h) = \frac{g[gU - C(p,h) - \Delta_{pair}]^{p+h-1}}{p!h!(p+h-1)!} f(n,U) \quad (3.6)$$

where $C(p,h)$ is the approximate correction factor associated with Pauli's exclusion principle,[6, 8]

$$C(p, h) = \frac{1}{4}(p^2 + h^2 - p - h) , \quad (3.7)$$

Δ_{pair} is an additional term to account for pairing among sp-states[24] and $f(n, U)$ is a term to account for the limited depth of the nuclear potential well.

The density of available states for transitions with $\Delta n=0$ is given by,[6, 25]

$$\omega_0(p, h, U) \approx \left(\frac{g}{2}\right) \frac{(gU - C(p, h))}{(p + h)} (p(p - 1) + h(h - 1) + 4ph) , \quad (3.8)$$

and for transitions that decrease the number of excitons by 2, by

$$\omega_-(p, h, U) \approx \left(\frac{g}{2}\right) ph(p + h - 2) . \quad (3.9)$$

where g is the density of sp-levels in the uniform-spacing model.

The explicit expression for the density of final states associated with $\Delta n=+2$ can be written in general terms as[8, 23]

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(p, h, U)\omega_+(p, h, U) &= \omega(p + 1, h + 1, U)\omega_-(p + 1, h + 1, U) \\ &\approx \frac{(p + 1)(h + 1)(p + h)}{2} g\omega(p + 1, h + 1, U) , \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega(p + 1, h + 1)}{\omega(p, h)} &= \frac{f(h + 1, U)}{f(h, U)} \frac{g[gU - C(p + 1, h + 1) - \Delta_{pair}]^{p+h+2-1}/(p + 1)!(h + 1)!(p + h + 2 - 1)!}{g[gU - C(p, h) - \Delta_{pair}]^{p+h+1}/p!h!(p + h - 1)!} \\ &\approx [gU - C(p, h) - \Delta_{pair}]^2 \frac{p!h!(p + h - 1)!}{(p + 1)!(h + 1)!(p + h + 2 - 1)!} \\ &= \frac{[gU - C(p, h) - \Delta_{pair}]^2}{(p + 1)(h + 1)(p + h)(p + h + 1)} , \end{aligned}$$

where we have used

$$\frac{g[gU - C(p + 1, h + 1) - \Delta_{pair}]^{p+h-1}}{g[gU - C(p, h) - \Delta_{pair}]^{p+h-1}} \approx 1$$

and $f(p, h, U) \approx f(p+1, h+1, U)$. Then, comparing with (3.5) results,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{2\pi M^2}{\hbar}\right)\omega^+(p, h, U) &= \left(\frac{2\pi M^2}{\hbar}\right)\left(\frac{g}{2}\right)(p+1)(h+1)(p+h)\frac{\omega(p+1, h+1)}{\omega(p, h)} = \\ &\approx \left(\frac{2\pi M^2}{\hbar}\right)\left(\frac{g}{2}\right)\frac{[gU - C(p, h) - \Delta_{pair}]^2}{(p+h+1)} = \lambda_+(p, h, U). \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

The rate of emission of ν -particles per unit time and energy in Eq.(3.3), $\lambda_\nu^c(n, U, \epsilon_\nu)$, is estimated independently with the help of the principle of detailed balance[26]

$$\lambda_\nu^c(n, U, \epsilon_\nu) = \left(\frac{2s_\nu + 1}{\pi^2 \hbar^3}\right) \mu_\nu \mathcal{A}_\nu(n) \sigma_\nu(\epsilon_\nu) \epsilon_\nu \frac{\omega_\nu(p-1, h, U - B_\nu - \epsilon_\nu)}{\omega(p, h, U)}, \quad (3.12)$$

where ϵ_ν is the kinetic energy of the emitted particle, s_ν is its spin and μ_ν is its reduced mass relative to the rest of the nuclear system. The semi-phenomenological factor $\mathcal{A}_\nu(n)$ ensures that the emitted particle is of type ν and defined consistently between the PE and the CN stages, in a procedure equivalent to the parameterization of Kalbach.[27]

4. Comparison of the DMF with the EXM

The transition strengths of the DMF, described in Sec.2 and Refs.[10, 11], are calculated by code **TRANSNU**(TST) for each possible microscopic process between excitons and summed over degenerate states, for each *class* of nuclear states defined by n .

The model space is defined by the Harmonic Oscillator (H.O.) basis of single particle states directly in terms of the hypergeometric function[28], with the usual addition of a strong spin-orbit term to modulate the fixed inter-spacing of the kinetic energy levels of the H.O. to try to adjust the resulting structure of nuclear levels to the observed one.[16]

Another useful option is to define *also* the modulation of levels semi-phenomenologically, by considering, for example, an arbitrary *fixed inter-spacing* between nuclear levels while keeping the other quantum numbers identical to the H.O. basis, but the modulation could in principle be arbitrary. This assumption corresponds to the approximation of considering the structure of the complex excited nuclear states as *unknown*, but similar enough to the ground state to be well described by one additional phenomenological parameter.

Note that both definitions are not obtained from the direct solution of the nuclear many-body problem and, therefore, they represent an intrinsic deficiency, or inconsistency, of the present definition of the DMF. This inconsistency could be minored by adopting a more realistic description for the nuclear potential, like the Woods-Saxon one,[29] or by attempting a direct definition of the nuclear mean field from an approximated microscopic solution of the many-body nuclear problem, like the Hartree-Fock approach.[17]

The Fermi energy, ϵ_F , is defined as the energy of the last occupied single particle state in the nuclear ground state and the energies of “particles”, are defined as the negative of their binding energy in the nuclear system,

$$\epsilon_p = \epsilon_F - \epsilon_l , \quad (4.1)$$

where ϵ_l is the energy of the sp-state belonging to sp-level “ l ”, with maximum binding, $\epsilon_{p,\max}$, given by the complete occupation of all “ A ” lower sp-states, where A is the mass number. The energy of the “holes” is

$$\epsilon_h = \epsilon_l - \epsilon_F \quad (4.2)$$

and all unoccupied sp-states above ϵ_F are considered possible hole states.

We neglect the hole states belonging to the level with energy ϵ_F .

We have made no restrictions regarding which “particle” states are “excitable” and considered all different possible configurations of p -particles and h -holes that can be distributed over the corresponding sp-states of the model spaces, as defined by the above rules.

4.1 The problem of large degeneracies

Following previous works [8, 10, 23] we have adopted the “never-come-back” approximation, i. e., restricted the possible transitions to $\Delta n=0,+2$, and considered the cases, listed in Table I, for microscopic transitions in which the number of excitons increases by 2 and the transitions, listed in Table II, that keep the number of excitons constant. The “representations” of each transition follow the original definition of Ref.[11] and the possible transitions are similar to those proposed in Ref.[23].

Table I - Microscopic transitions with $\Delta n = +2$.

case	representation	description
1	(2100←1000)	proton-h-propagates and proton-ph-pair is created
2	(1011←1000)	proton-h-propagates and neutron-ph-pair is created
3	(1110←0010)	neutron-h-propagates and proton-ph-pair is created
4	(0021←0010)	neutron-h-propagates and proton-ph-pair is created
5	(1200←0100)	proton-p-propagates and proton-ph-pair is created
6	(0111←0100)	proton-p-propagates and neutron-ph-pair is created
7	(1101←0001)	neutron-p-propagates and proton-ph-pair is created
8	(0012←0001)	neutron-p-propagates and neutron-ph-pair is created

For given exciton class $\{n, U\}$, the nuclear configurations can be described by a sequence of n indices that characterizes their corresponding set of exciton sp-states. The latter are given in this work by the full description of the H.O. basis, $|\epsilon, s, m_s, l, m_l, \tau\rangle$, where τ is the isospin, ϵ the sp-energy, (s, m_s) the spin and spin projection and (l, m_l) the orbital angular momentum, etc..

Independently of the specific values of the quantum numbers characterizing sp-states, they can always be in *biunivocal* (one to one) relationship with the “particle” and “hole” states of the model space, therefore defining a sequence of unique indices to describe these states, $\{n_{ph}, n_{nh}, n_{pp}, n_{np}\}$, as follows: if the total number of *excitable* proton-hole states (*ph*) in the model space is m_{ph} , the total number of *excitable* neutron-hole states (*nh*) is m_{nh} , neutron-particles (*np*) m_{np} and proton-particles (*pp*) m_{pp} , then one can define these indices as

$$1 \leq n_{ph} \leq m_{ph} , \quad (4.3)$$

$$m_{ph} \leq n_{nh} \leq m_{ph} + m_{nh} , \quad (4.4)$$

$$m_{ph} + m_{nh} \leq n_{pp} \leq m_{ph} + m_{nh} + m_{pp} , \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$m_{ph} + m_{nh} + m_{pp} \leq n_{np} \leq m_{ph} + m_{nh} + m_{pp} + m_{np} , \quad (4.6)$$

and an arbitrary configuration with, for example, 3 excitons consisting of one proton-hole and a neutron particle-hole pair can be uniquely indicated by the sequence (n_{ph}, n_{nh}, n_{nh}) ; a configuration

with 4 excitons, being one particle-hole proton pair and one particle-hole neutron pair, can be indicated by $(n_{ph}, n_{pp}, n_{nh}, n_{nh})$, etc..

Table II - Microscopic transitions with $\Delta n=0$.

case	representation	description
9	(1100←0011)	neutron-ph-pair is destroyed and proton-ph-pair is created
10	(2000←2000)	scattering of two proton-h excitons
11	(1010←1010)	scattering of a neutron-h and a proton-h
12	(0020←0020)	scattering of two neutron-h
13	(0200←0200)	scattering of two proton-p
14	(0101←0101)	scattering of a neutron-p and a proton-p
15	(0002←0002)	scattering of two neutron-p
16	(1100←1100)	scattering of a proton-ph pair
17	(1001←1001)	scattering of a proton-h-neutron-p pair
18	(0110←0110)	scattering of a neutron-h-proton-p pair
19	(0011←0011)	scattering of a neutron-ph pair

Notice that this association is biunivocal because we are making the correspondence of one independent sp-state with one value of each index, therefore the different combinatorial sets of sp-states (nuclear configurations defined by a set of excitons states) will be represented by different sets of indices and all possible configurations will be described.

Here the problem of “large numbers” becomes apparent. For example, if we consider a typical model space with $m_{ph}=m_{nh}=28$ available sp-states for holes and $m_{pp}=m_{np}=9$ available sp-state for particles, the number of possible configurations may be very large for large n . One would have nearly 24 million total configurations for ^{56}Fe excited at 60 MeV, and the number of possible scatterings of pairs of excitons, to describe transitions in which $\Delta n=0$, would possibly involve up to 10^{12} different combinations and the estimated time for direct computation, using personal computer, would become of the order of 10^5 secs or more to obtain all the TST listed in Tables I and II as a function of U , for a given n .

One simplifying aspect of the problem is that, according to the general expressions of the DMF the matrix elements of the residual potential (see (3.1)) can be calculated independently for each combination of initial and final nuclear configurations and do not depend on the properties of the nuclear system as a whole, except for the self-consistent nuclear mean field. This independence would be compromised if rotational and vibrational nuclear modes were to be considered as part of the potential energy of sp-states.

The mean-field is assumed to be local and to include the effects of rotation and vibration of the entire system phenomenologically, as explained below, with all interactions completely represented by the adopted basis of sp-states.

For example, the term of the pre-equilibrium Hamiltonian that increases the number of particles and holes by 2 is,[10, 11]

$$\begin{aligned} (a_\alpha^+ a_\beta^+ b_\delta^+ b_\gamma^+ | b_\gamma b_\delta a_\beta a_\alpha) &= \sum_{\binom{12}{UM}} \sum_{(\alpha\beta\delta\gamma)} |V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}|^2 \langle ph | a_\alpha^+ a_\beta^+ b_\delta^+ b_\gamma^+ | p'h' \rangle \langle p'h' | b_\gamma b_\delta a_\beta a_\alpha | ph \rangle \\ &= \sum_{(1)} \sum_{(St)} e^{[UM]} \sum_{(\alpha\beta\delta\gamma)} |V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}|^2 d(p - 2 \neq \alpha\beta, h - 2 \neq \delta\gamma, S, t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

where $|V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}|^2$ depends only on the sp-states being created or destroyed, in this case sp-states $(\alpha, \beta, \delta, \gamma)$ were not present in the initial configuration and were added to the final one, but $V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ does not depend on U or (p, h) , it is not a direct function of the particular configurations $|p, h, U\rangle$ and $|p', h', U'\rangle$ in which the transition occurred, only indirectly through the sp-basis. Therefore, for given exciton numbers and U the number of matrix elements that need to be calculated decrease by a factor of $d(p - 2 \neq \alpha\beta, h - 2 \neq \delta\gamma, U, M)$, with similar results for the other microscopic transitions.

On the other hand, if for each type of microscopic transition j_{am} is the maximum value of the sp-states angular momentum and it is no greater than a given maximum n_0 , in units of $\hbar/2$ (for example $n_0=20$), and use the above definitions for m_{ph} , m_{nh} , etc., then the total number of elements of the $V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ matrix that need to be stored is *smaller* than,

$$d_{\max} = n_0 d_b^4, \quad (4.8)$$

where $d_b = m_{\max} + 1$, $m_{\max} = \max(m_{nh}, m_{ph}, m_{np}, m_{pp})$, $d_1 = n_0 d_b$, $d_2 = d_1 d_b = n_0 d_b^2$, $d_3 = d_2 d_b = n_0 d_b^3$ and $d_{\max} = d_3 d_b$. This is essentially equal to the procedure used to represent integers using only the digits from 0 to 9, in terms of powers of “10”, which in this case has been replaced by powers of “ d_b ” with n_0 replacing d_b in the “zeroth power”. Therefore, for each sequence of 4 sp-states, corresponding to one microscopic transition, with indices given by the parameters defined in (4.3) to (4.6) one can define an index

$$n_{ind} = n_{i2} + (i_2 - 1) \times d_{\max}, \quad (4.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} n_{i2} &= (n_1 n_0 + n_2 d_1 + n_3 d_2 + n_4 d_3 + j_{am}) \\ &= (n_1 n_0 + n_2 n_0 d_b + n_3 n_0 d_b^2 + n_4 n_0 d_b^3 + j_{am}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

and i_2 indicates the different types of microscopic transitions, as in Table I and Table II above.

Because $\{n_1, n_2, n_3, n_4\}$ are supposed to be no greater than m_{\max} it is clear that

$$\max\{n_1 n_0 + j_{am}\} = \max\{n_1\} n_0 + \max\{j_{am}\} = m_{\max} n_0 + n_0 = d_b n_0 = d_1$$

similarly $\max\{n_1 n_0 + n_2 d_1 + j_{am}\} = d_2$, $\max\{n_1 n_0 + n_2 d_1 + n_3 d_2 + j_{am}\} = d_3$ and

$$\max\{n_1 n_0 + n_2 d_1 + n_3 d_2 + n_4 d_3 + j_{am}\} = d_{\max}.$$

Therefore, n_{i_2} in (4.9) is never greater than d_{\max} , the various indices for transitions with different “ i_2 ” belong to different ranges of values of n_{ind} and the relation between these indices and the possible microscopic transitions is biunivocal.

Then, the matrix elements can be stored in repository files, as a function of “ i_2 ”, instead of being repeatedly calculated for each new TST. The sequence of indices defining the possible configurations and their energies, for each n , can also be calculated and stored in an series of independent input files that will be read only when the $|\text{initial}\rangle$ configuration has n excitons, where $|\text{initial}\rangle$ is the nuclear configuration before the microscopic transition takes place.

Typically storage files containing all possible nuclear configurations for a given n , may have 10^7 lines or more depending on the maximum excitation energy, the number of excitons and the spacing between levels of the sp-basis. In these cases the total number of microscopic transitions is of the order of 10^{14} , but using the above simplifying rules and definitions of indices, these calculations can still be performed using personal computers with not too long running times.

4.1.1 Nuclear Rotational and Vibrational modes

If the potential energies for the vibration and rotation of the whole nuclear system have not been taken into account in the definition of the sp-basis, the potential energy of the total system, in its rotational and vibrational modes, can be exchanged with the individual sp-states being created or destroyed during the microscopic transition and originate a $|\text{final}\rangle$ with excitation energy *different* from $|\text{initial}\rangle$. On the other hand, for a given maximum excitation U_{\max} , defined, for example, by the incident energy in proton or neutron induced reactions, the energies of $|\text{initial}\rangle$ and $|\text{final}\rangle$ configurations associated with each microscopic transition must not be greater than U_{\max} .

The non conservation of the excitation energy at each microscopic transition, to account for exchanges with dynamical modes of the whole system that are missing in the potential energy of sp-states, can be taken into account approximately by using a range of possible energies for each microscopic transition, $U_{\text{final}}=U_{\text{initial}}+\Delta U$, with ΔU defined phenomenologically.

The necessity of a phenomenological ΔU is another deficiency, or inconsistency, of the present version of the DMF, but it can be eliminated straightforwardly by including potentials to describe the coupling of the rotational and vibrational modes of the nuclear system to the movement of the sp-states, in addition to the mean-field generated by the microscopic interactions among nucleons. Such potentials were not included in the present work.

The eigenfunctions of the H.O. basis are given by known expressions in terms of hypergeometric function.[28] The matrix elements $V_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ are defined in **TRANSNU** by direct computation of the integrals of the wave-functions (Hermite and Laguerre integrations over the configuration space) of the exciton states coming in and out of the microscopic transition, in the center of mass (CM) system, and using the Green function of the *non interacting* two-body Hamiltonian for the propagation of the pair of “colliding” excitons before and after the transition,[30]

$$\frac{e^{ik|\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2|}}{|\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2|} = k \sum_{(l=0)}^{\infty} (2l+1) j_l(kr_{<}) h_l^{(+)}(kr_{>}) P_l(\cos\alpha) \quad (4.11)$$

in accordance with the IPM hypothesis.[10]

4.2 Numerical results

The TST as a function of (n,U) tend to increase for given n and increasing U , because the state density (degeneracy of nuclear configurations) tends to be larger for larger U , although they are not strongly dependent on U . This is a consequence of the mathematical definitions, for example, Eq.(4.7).

In addition, the maximum value of U , U_{max} , in part defines the “size” of the model space because, from (4.2), the number of “hole” sp-states and the maximum “hole” sp-energy may vary with U , depending on how realistic the description of the sp-states is, although the number of “particle” sp-states is always fixed by the nuclear mass. Then, depending on the description, if one considers arbitrarily large excitations the TST could increase arbitrarily and become meaningless.

A simple phenomenological solution is to consider a sp-energy cutoff, ϵ_{cut} , to set a maximum for the hole energies, that would both limit the size of the model space and yield physically meaningful TST independently of the specific description of the sp-states.

The necessity of a cut-off energy for sp-states is a third deficiency of the DMF, as this maximum should be deducible from the general basic assumptions of the model. This is a less important deficiency though than the one regarding the non-possibility of solution of the nuclear many-body problem and the *necessity* of an approximate basis, because one expects that for high enough energies the “hole-state” would in fact be in the continuum and the transition would be an “emission”, not important for the definition of the TST.

Therefore, a parameter like ϵ_{cut} is physically expected from a realistic description of the nuclear mean-field and the inconsistency could be resolved by adopting a more realistic nuclear potential, like the Woods-Saxon one, instead of the H.O., with a well defined upper limit for sp-energies above which lies the continuum spectrum.[16, 29]

The TST measure the strength of each microscopic interaction and are directly connected with the observed cross sections. They should have well defined values independent of U_{max} , as the cross sections for a given reaction cannot depend, for example, on the energy of the incident particle, when all physical processes have been considered.

In this work the numerical results were obtained using the H.O. basis and an arbitrarily fixed ϵ_{cut} , independent of U_{max} . The latter being used to limit only the maximum energy of $|\text{initial}\rangle$. The energy of $|\text{final}\rangle$ was also limited by ΔU , as explained in Sec.4.1.1.

4.2.1 Comparison with TNG and EXM.

In a previous work[31], we presented the **TNG** estimates of the cross sections of some p-induced reactions on ^{56}Fe and here we assess how the DMF affects the transition rates (TR) and cross sections for the same reactions.

The comparison of the TST with the transition rates (TR’s) of **TNG** or EXM[14] show important differences, in particular the TST corresponding to transitions that increase n by 2 have relatively too large variations as a function of U , being too small for low U but similar to the TR’s at maximum.

Taking the results of **TNG** as reference, this suggests that either the TST are not correctly defined in the DMF, or the numeric approximations used in TRANSNU are inadequate or the TST represent, in fact, an improvement over the traditional definitions of **TNG** and the EXM.

The TR’s of **TNG** or EXM have similar behavior, although not exactly the same functional form as functions of (n,U) . They are defined by similar phenomenological relations in both cases, but in **TNG** the transition parameters are based on the model developed by Kalbach [4, 20] and

correspond to a more elaborated version of the “standard” EXM than the model presented in Ref.[14].

In general, the TR calculated by **TNG** or the EXM show strong dependence on (n,U) , but the functional form does not vary too much for increasing U , as we see in Fig. 1, where λ_+ and λ_- are the rates for transitions that increase or decrease n by 2, respectively.




Figure 1. Transition rates calculated in the EXM and by **TNG** as a function of the number of holes for excitation energies 20, 40 and 80 MeV. The functions are smooth, but show strong dependence on (n,U) .

The $\lambda_+(n,U)$ of the EXM in Fig. 1(a) vary smoothly along the complexity chain, tending to have a single well defined global maximum as a function of n , for high excitations, while the $\lambda_+(n,U)$ of **TNG**, Fig.1(b), are decreasing functions of n for all U .

In both cases the most probable exciton number is approximately given by $\tilde{n} = (gU)^{1/2}$. [32]

As we saw in (3.5) and (3.10), $\lambda_+(n,U)$ is proportional to the density of nuclear states after the transition and to the TR for the reversed process,

$$\frac{\lambda_+(p, h, U)}{\lambda_-(p+1, h+1, U)} = \frac{\omega(p+1, h+1, U)}{\omega(p, h, U)} = r_\omega(n, U). \quad (4.12)$$

Therefore, the total transition rate for configurations belonging to a given exciton class, $\Lambda(n,U)$ in (3.4), is a function of $r_\omega(n,U)$ and approximately a function of $\lambda_+(n,U)(1+1/r_\omega(n,U))$. The ratio

$r_\omega(n,U)$ decreases rapidly from one class to the next and becomes negligible for n larger than \tilde{n} . Consequently, the term $(1+1/r_\omega(n,U))$ becomes very large for large n , favoring the time variations of occupation probabilities with n smaller than \tilde{n} .

This strong dependence of $\Lambda(n,U)$ on $\lambda_+(n,U)(1+1/r_\omega(n,U))$ is very important for the PE-emissions because, if λ_+ is large, the occupation probabilities, $P_\nu(n,U,t)$ in Eq.(3.3), tend to be larger for low n at the moment of emission.

In fact, in **TNG**, the $P_\nu(n,U,t)$ are assumed to be very high for low n , i. e. close to 0.5, for $n=1$, for protons and neutrons (and nearly zero for alphas), with the probabilities of classes that have n close to \tilde{n} tending to increase at each successive iteration of (3.3). Due to the relation between $\lambda_+(n,U)$ and $\lambda_-(n+1,U)$ in Eq.(4.12), **TNG** assumes that a PE emission happens when the ratio of $P_\nu(n,U,t)$ between successive exciton classes becomes approximately equal to the corresponding ratios of densities. Then, if $\lambda_+(n,U)$ increases, the ratio of $P_\nu(n,U,t)$ over $P_\nu(n+1,U,t)$ will increase and have a greater chance to be equal to the (large) ratios of the corresponding nuclear densities for low n , and emissions in this region will be favored.

Having in sight that PE emissions at low n tend to happen more frequently for lower energies, as they correspond to the excitation of less particles from the ground state sp-levels, larger $\lambda_+(n,U)$ tend also to favor emissions with lower U , therefore increasing cross sections in this region of energies.

Due to the strong relation with PE-emissions, the direct use of the function $r_\omega(n,U)$ was introduced in the master equation (3.3) of **TNG**, giving additional consistency for the evaluation of \tilde{n} and the emission rates, $\lambda_\nu^c(n,U,\epsilon_\nu)$ in Eq.(3.12), as opposed to an independent definition of these parameters. This yielded smoother excitation functions in the regions where different exciton classes contribute to the emission process.

The corresponding parameters λ_+ and λ_0 calculated with TRANSNU are shown in Fig. 2. Note that in Fig. 2(a) λ_0 is many orders of magnitude greater than λ_+ for all (n,U) and λ_- is not calculated, in TRANSNU, in accordance with of the “never-come-back” assumption.

The ratio of the parameters for “intra-class”, λ_0 , and “inter-class”, λ_+ , transitions,

$$r_{ex}(n,U) = \frac{\lambda_0(n,U)}{\lambda_+(n,U)}, \quad (4.13)$$

is usually *greater than* “1000”, which is a “threshold” suggested by Pompeia and Carlson[8] to warrant the validity of the exciton model description. The large $r_{ex}(n,U)$ obtained with TRANSNU would validate one of the basic assumptions of the exciton model, that each exciton class can be considered as reaching equilibrium, perfect configuration mixing, before emission or inter-class transitions, but it is in conflict with the results of Ref.[8].

The ratio $r_{ex}(n,U)$ in Fig. 2(a) does not vary importantly as a function of n , for a given U , which means that complete configuration mixing should occur at all stages of the complexity chain, with no important difference for all energies. This is in marked contrast with the results obtained with the H.O. basis, in Fig.2(b), where the λ_0 become smaller than the λ_+ for large n , due to a general relative increase of λ_+ for low n , especially for low excitations. The discontinuity of the derivative of the TST, especially for low U , are due to numeric precision and not related to definition of the functions.




Figure 2. Transition rates λ_+ and λ_0 calculated by TRANSNU as a function of the number of holes for excitation energies 20, 40 and 80 MeV. The functions are smooth and show strong dependence on (n,U) , but λ_+ has more pronounced variation with (n,U) than the corresponding **TNG** or **EXM** functions.

The $\lambda_+(n,U)$ of **TRANSNU** in Fig. 2 show a more complicate behavior as a function of n , than the TR's **TNG** or **EXM**, resulting in part from the influence of the structure of excited nuclear levels on the evolution of the complexity chain, but mainly the microscopic interaction among nucleons.

This influence is even clearer in the dependence of the TST with U , as we see in Fig. 3, especially for the H.O. based estimate. The decreasing magnitudes for high energies indicate only the decreasing number of combinations due to the limitations imposed on the model space. It is

not present in the TR's of the phenomenological approaches.




Figure 3. Transition strengths of TRANSNU as a function of U , multiplied by 1000 to distinguish the curves more clearly, for transitions that increase n by 2, for $n=1, 4$ and 7 . The curves for $n=3, 5$ and 6 are very close to $n=4$, with similar “plateaus” in the same regions.

The mean-field parameter of Fermi’s Golden Rule, term $|\langle n+2|V(U)|n\rangle|^2$ in Eq.(3.5), can be defined as the sum of all expected values of the operator of microscopic transitions, for given (n,U) , or the mean potential energy for transitions without emission. It has relatively low magnitudes and non uniform variation, with the formation of approximate “plateaus” around 20, 30, 40 and 50 MeV and increasing magnitude in between these regions. The “plateaus” are more well defined for larger U , as we see in Fig. 4 for the H.O. based model space.

On the other hand, as we see in Fig. 5, the TR’s of **TNG** or **EXM** vary smoothly with U and the relatively high magnitudes of the TR’s for low n , in comparison with the corresponding TST, does not reflect the fact that in these regions the density of excited states is expected to be low in nuclear systems and, therefore, the TR’s should increase with n , at least in the region close to zero.

The presumed large density for low n of the phenomenological models is an unjustifiable heritage of the old theory of metals, i. e. the approximate assumption of a “highly degenerated Fermi gas”, independent of n , [33], and it should be discarded. The TR’s of **EXM** only show the expected dependence with n for high excitations, while the **TNG** parameters do not have this dependence for any value of U .

Mean Field, $|V(n,U)|^2$, from TRANSNU for transitions that increase n by 2, for $n=1,3,5,7$ and 9




Figure 4. Nuclear mean-field for transitions that increase n by 2, $|\langle n+2|V(U)|n\rangle|^2$, calculated by TRANSNU, for the H.O. based model space, for various number of excitons.




Figure 5. Transition strengths of the EXM and TNG as functions of U , for transitions that increase n by 2, for $n=1, 2, 3, 4$ and 5.

The low values of the TST for low n reflect the fact that the density of states grows quickly in this region, due to the fast increase in the number of configurations for increasing number of excitons. Therefore, the TST have a more realistic description of the low n region than the usual phenomenological approach.

The non cumulative densities of levels for the EXM are shown in Fig. 6. The corresponding functions for **TNG** are very similar. They have no oscillations, because the statistical models assume no structure of nuclear levels, and increase rapidly for low U , tending to flat for high energies.




Figure 6. Non cumulative nuclear level densities for transitions that increase n by 2 in the EXM, as a function of U , for $n=1$ to $n=5$.

The corresponding functions calculated by TRANSNU have oscillatory behavior and tend to decrease for high energies, due to ϵ_{cut} , as we see in Fig. 7. In this case, the non-cumulative density of nuclear levels results directly from combinatorial calculations.




Figure 7. Non cumulative nuclear level densities calculated by TRANSNU as a function of U , for transitions that increase n by 2, for $n=1, 3$ and 6.

4.2.2 Comparison with EXFOR

The cross sections for p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe are shown in the following figures. The main procedure of **TNG** was used for the evaluation of the cross sections and the functions for the TR's of the EXM and the TST of TRANSNU were calculated independently and used as input of **TNG**.

The cross sections calculated with the **TNG** model and the independent definition of the EXM of Ref.[14] are shown in Figs. 7 and 8, respectively.

The two estimates are approximately the same despite the differences of the corresponding $\lambda_+(n,U)$, as we saw in Figs. 1 and 5. These differences become important only for a detailed description of the excitation functions, for smaller ranges of U .

After the consistent redefinition of λ_- is made, from λ_+ , using $r_\omega(n,U)$ in the master equation, the resulting cross sections obtained with **TNG**[19, 20] or the EXM of [14] are almost identical, indicating that the general behavior of the TR's and their magnitudes, whether oscillatory or uniform as functions of (n,U) , are more important than the specific functional dependence.

The same cross sections calculated with the $\lambda_+(n,U)$ of **TRANSNU** are given in Fig.9, for the constant inter-spacing basis and Fig.10 for the H.O. basis. Although the estimates are not as

good as the phenomenological ones they have a reasonably correct description of the experimental cross sections for the activation energy, the local maxima and average magnitude.

It is mainly the magnitude for small regions of U that is not well defined by the present version of the DMF, due to the different dependence of the TST with the energy, for the various n in comparison with the EXM or **TNG** functions, as we see in Fig. 3 and Fig. 5, respectively.

The TST tend to oscillate with energy, while the phenomenological TR's have uniform dependence. The uniformity means that the ratio of TR's for reversed processes, $r_\omega(n,U)$ in Eq.(4.12), is approximately the same for energies close to each other and $\Delta n=0,\pm 2$. Therefore, \tilde{n} will also be a uniform function of U and the contributions for emission of the various exciton classes will be well defined, for each small region around a given U , with excitation functions determined by the activation energies of the various residual nuclides and the magnitude of λ_+ , as explained in the analysis of $r_\omega(n,U)$.

In the case of an oscillating $\tilde{n}(n,U)$ the contributions of neighboring energies will not be uniform and the correct description of the excitation functions will be more directly dependent on the magnitude of $\lambda_+(U)$, to compensate for the non uniformity of $\tilde{n}(U)$, especially for low n .




Figure 8. Cross sections for p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe calculated with TNG.




Figure 9. Cross sections for p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe calculated with the EXM formulation of Ref.[14].




Figure 10. Cross sections for p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe calculated with the TST obtained with the constant interspacing between sp -levels in the model space of **TRANSNU**.




Figure 11. Cross sections for p -induced reactions on ^{56}Fe calculated with the TST obtained with the H.O. sp-levels in the model `sapce` of **TRANSNU**.

5. Final Comments and Conclusion

We made a simplified presentation of some important aspects of the DMF and the **TNG** model code to show their most relevant features and differences, to compare the results of model codes **TRANSNU** and **TNG** for the evaluation of PE-emission cross sections.

The cross sections calculated with **TNG** have been shown to be equivalent to those obtained with an independent definition of the EXM given in Ref.[14], as we see in Figs. 8 and 9.

We used the strong dependence of the PE emission on the parameter $r_\omega(n,U)$ of Eq.(4.12), in **TNG**, to redefine λ_- consistently from the λ_+ in the master equation (3.3) and obtain smoother excitation functions in the regions where different exciton classes contribute. The resulting p-induced cross sections on ^{56}Fe obtained with **TNG**[19, 20] or the EXM of [14] are almost identical, indicating that the general uniform behavior of the TR's and their magnitudes as a function of (n,U) is more important than the specific functional dependence, as exemplified by the functions plotted in Fig. 1. The specific dependence is important only for the detailed description of the excitation functions for each small region of U , because it affects $r_\omega(n,U)$.

On the other hand, the parameters of **TRANSNU**, the TST, tend to vary more pronouncedly and non uniformly than the corresponding phenomenological ones, especially as a function of U and for low n , being very low for low U . This is the main cause of the large differences with experimental cross sections obtained with the parameters of **TRANSNU**, very close to regions where the excitation function is reasonably well estimated.

We saw that due to the strong relation of $r_\omega(n,U)$ with PE-emissions, the oscillations of the estimated excitation functions are related to the incorrect compensation of the oscillations of \tilde{n} and the TST as function of (n,U) .

The oscillating behavior of the $\lambda_+(n,U)$ of **TRANSNU** in Figs. 2 and 3 was determined in part by similar oscillations of combinatorial origin of the nuclear level density of favorable states, $\omega_+(n,U)$, but mainly by the non uniformity of the total expected value of the operator of microscopic transitions, $|\langle n+2|V(U)|n\rangle|^2$ in Eq.(3.3) and Fig. 4, which is in part due to lack of enough numerical precision of the present calculations.

The total mean-field associated with $\lambda_+(n,U)$ of **TRANSNU** has regions of nearly flat dependence on U , which is completely absent in the phenomenological models. In addition, it shows a steady increase for low U and low n , which is in agreement with the fact that nuclear densities tend to increase rapidly for low n and is physically more correct than the relatively large λ_+ for low n of the phenomenological estimates. Therefore, in this respect, the TST represent an improvement over the phenomenological TR's.

5.1 Deficiencies of the present version of the DMF

The definition of the model space in TRANSNU, either using the complete H.O. basis with strong spin-orbit “modulation” or the same single particle basis except for the constraint that the sp-levels have fixed inter-spacing, are essentially phenomenological as they are not obtained from the direct solution of the nuclear many-body problem. Therefore, it represents an intrinsic *deficiency* of the present form of the DMF, because it is not obtained directly from the microscopic definitions, as the formalism prescribes. This inconsistency with the original proposal of the DMF cannot be avoided, but it can be minored by using an approximate self-consistent definition of the nuclear mean-field, as the Hartree-Fock approach.[17] Having in sight that strong nuclear forces are still not fully understood,[34] the research of self-consistent approaches for the nuclear mean-field could be an important and fruitful branch in the future developments of the DMF.

The use of the H.O. basis, either with constant inter-spacing or strong spin-orbit coupling, makes the number of hole sp-states above ϵ_F in the nuclear ground-state *infinite*, because the H.O. potential is an infinite parabolic well. This particular inconsistency was avoided in this work by using an arbitrary cut-off energy, ϵ_{cut} , to define a maximum value for the hole sp-levels, ϵ_h , but it could be solved in a more mathematically consistent way by adopting the basis of a finite realistic potential, like the Woods-Saxon one.[29]

Even if the maximum hole energy is finite, the total nuclear excitation energy can still be infinite, if the H.O. basis is used and the number of excitons is large enough, then another energy cut-off, for the entire nuclear system, must be defined, U_{max} , to avoid infinite nuclear excitation. This is also a minor inconsistency of our present calculations that could be avoided with a realistic nuclear mean-field potential.

Although U_{max} naturally limits ϵ_{cut} , the two cutoffs are in fact independent because the first determines the size of the model space and the number of hole states contained in the range defined by the second. The independent definition U_{max} and ϵ_{cut} yields continuous TST as a function of ϵ_{cut} , which is the physically expected behavior, while if only U_{max} is defined the TST, for given (n, U) , become a function of the cutoff. The calculated TST are not strongly dependent on ϵ_{cut} but tend to have increasing magnitudes for increasing ϵ_{cut} because the degeneracy of nuclear configurations also increases when there are more hole sp-states available for transition.

Therefore, we used an independent definition U_{max} and ϵ_{cut} in this work.

At last, a third inconsistency of the present version of the DMF is related with the dynamical modes of the system as a whole. For a given maximum excitation U_{max} the energies of the configurations associated with each microscopic transition, $|\mathbf{initial}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{final}\rangle$, must not be greater than U_{max} , but the potential energy of the total nuclear system, in its rotational and vibra-

tional modes, can be exchanged with the individual sp-states being created or destroyed during the transition and possibly originate a $|\mathbf{final}\rangle$ with excitation energy *different* from $|\mathbf{initial}\rangle$. [35]

The non conservation of the excitation energy, in the version of the DMF used in this work, was taken into account approximately by using a range of possible values for the variation of energy for each microscopic transition, $U_{\mathbf{final}}=U_{\mathbf{initial}}+\Delta U$, with ΔU defined phenomenologically. The necessity to consider a phenomenological ΔU can be solved by considering the coupling between the sp-states and the collective modes of the total nuclear system in the definition of the basis of the model space.

Therefore, only one inconsistency of the present version of the DMF is unavoidable, and the others should introduce corrections in the magnitudes and oscillatory behavior of the TST as functions of (n,U) , in the various “small regions” of U , defined by the different sets of n that importantly contribute to the excitation functions in each region.

5.2 Conclusion

Despite the inconsistencies of the version of the DMF used in this work and the not completely solved numerical problems, related mainly with precision of the calculations, to eliminate the physically non meaningful noises in the strong oscillations of the TST, especially with U and for low n , we consider the results presented in this work very promising.

We believe that the cross sections for the p -induced on ^{56}Fe are a good estimate of the quality of the calculations that the present version of TRANSNU can offer.

The possibility of a consistent redefinition of λ_- from λ_+ , in the determination of $\tilde{n}(n,U)$ in **TNG**, made the results of TRANSNU, for the TST of $^{56}\text{Fe}(p,x)$ reactions, qualitatively correct. In particular, we obtained good estimates for the average magnitudes of the cross sections, for the majority of small regions of the excitation functions where the phenomenological description is also well defined.

References

- [1] J. J. Griffin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **17**, 478 (1966);
 J. J. Griffin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **B 24**, 5 (1967);
 G. D. Harp, J. M. Miller and B. J. Berne, Phys. Rev. **165**, 1166 (1968);
 G. D. Harp and J. M. Miller, Phys. Rev. **C 3**, 1847 (1971).
- [2] Hybrid Model: M. Blann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **27** , 337 (1971); M. Blann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28** ,
 757 (1972); M. Blann and H. K. Vonach, Phys. Rev. **C 28** , 1475 (1983).
- [3] Standard Exciton Model: C. K. Cline and M. Blann, Nucl. Phys. **A 172** , 225 (1971); C.
 K. Cline, Nucl. Phys. **A 210** , 590 (1973); J. Dobes and E. Betak, Nucl. Phys. **A 272** , 353
 (1976); E. Gadioli and E. Gadioli-Erba, Nucl. Instrum. Methods **146** , 265 (1977).
- [4] C. Kalbach-Cline, Nucl. Phys. **A 195**, 353(1972).
- [5] C. Bloch in *Les Houches Lectures (1968)*, ed. C. De Witt and V. Gillet (Gordon & Breach,
 New York, 1969) pg. 305
- [6] F. C. Williams, Jr., Nucl. Phys. **A166**, 231 (1971).
- [7] T. Ericson, Adv. in Phys. **9** (1960) 425.
- [8] C.A. Soares Pompeia and B.V. Carlson, Phys. Rev. C **74**, 054609 (2006).
- [9] J. Bisplinghoff, Phys. Rev. C **33**,1569 (1986).
- [10] F. B. Guimaraes and B. V. Carlson, *A direct microscopic approach to transition strengths in
 pre-equilibrium reactions* (2011), arXiv:1106.4283v2 [nucl-th].
- [11] B. V. Carlson, personal communication with the original paper with the formalism for nuclear
 transition strengths and the original version of code TRANSNU (2005).
- [12] F. C. Williams, Jr., Nucl. Phys. **A 133** , 33 (1969).
- [13] P. J. Brussaard and P. W. M. Glaudemans *Shell-Model Applications in Nuclear Spectroscopy*
 (Ed. North-Holland Pub. Co., Amsterdam, 1977).
- [14] A. J. Koning and M. C. Duijvestijn, Nucl. Phys. **A 744**, 15 (2004)
- [15] F. Reif, *Fundamentals of Statistical and Thermal Physics* (Ed. McGraw-Hill Series in Funda-
 mentals of Physics, 1965).

- [16] P. Ring and P. Shuck - *The Nuclear Many-Body Problem* (Ed. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980).
- [17] A. L. Fetter e J. D. Walecka - *Quantum Theory of Many-Particle Systems* (Ed. McGraw Hill, New York, 1971).
- [18] R. C. Hilborn, *Am. J. Phys.* **50**, 982-986 (1982).
- [19] C. Y. Fu, *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* **92**, 440 (1986);
F. B. Guimaraes and C. Y. Fu, *TNG-GENOA User's Manual*, Technical Report ORNL/TM-2000/252 (2000), Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S.A..
- [20] C. Kalbach, *Phys. Rev. C* **23**, 124 (1981).; C. Kalbach, *Phys. Rev. C* **28**, 124 (1986).;
- [21] H. A. Bethe, *Phys. Rev.* **50**, 332 (1936).
- [22] W. Hauser and H. Feshbach, *Phys. Rev.* **87**, 366 (1952).
- [23] F. C. Williams, Jr., *Phys. Lett.* **B31**, 184 (1970).
- [24] C. Y. Fu, *Nucl. Sci. Eng.* **86**, 344 (1984).;
- [25] C. Y. Fu, *A Consistent Nuclear Model For Compound and Precompound Reactions with Conservation of Angular Momentum*, Technical Report ORNL/TM-7042 (1980), Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S.A.
- [26] C. Kalbach-Cline and M. Blann, *Nucl. Phys.* **A172**, 225 (1971)
- [27] C. Kalbach-Cline, *Nucl. Phys.* **A210**, 590 (1973)
- [28] P. J. Brussaard and P. W. M. Glaudemans, *Shell-model Applications in Nuclear Spectroscopy*, Ed. North-Holland Pub. Co., Amsterdam (1977).
- [29] R. D. Woods and D. S. Saxon, *Phys. Rev.* **95**, 577 (1954)
- [30] A. Messiah, *Quantum Mechanics - Vol. I* (Ed. North-Holland Pub. Co., Amsterdam, 1961).
The important expressions for the free particle propagator can be found on the Appendix B.
- [31] F. B. Guimaraes, *A Microscopic Method to Generate the Nuclear Spin Distribution Function*, Technical Report IEAv-ENU/RP-012/2008 (2008), São José dos Campos - Brazil.
- [32] J. J. Griffin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **17**, 478 (1966).
- [33] F. B. Guimaraes, *Analysis of the Independent Particle Model approach to Nuclear Densities* (2012), arXiv:1208.6555 [nucl-th].

- [34] Jere H. Jenkins *et.al.*, *Evidence for Correlations Between Nuclear Decay Rates and Earth-Sun Distance* (2008), arXiv:0808.3283 [astro-ph].
- [35] O. K. Rice Phys. Rev. **33**, 1929 (748).

This figure "compare-oxm-levdnc-nts1-ttn-11p0e+03-timlofromhi.jpg" is available in

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "compare-transnu-levdnc.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mixf-fe56-nts1-ttn-11p0e+03-timlofromhi.jpg" is available in "jpg" form

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mixf-fe56-nts2-ttn-4p0e+06-newnx.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mixf-fe56-nts0-default-factim1-09-16-13.jpg" is available in "jpg" form

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "compare-transnu-tst-31-with-ho31.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mfield-from-interpout12-ho31-case.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mixf-fe56-nts2-ttn-4p0e+06-ho31-newnx.jpg" is available in "jpg" form

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mixf-pics-compare-oxma-tngb-trs.jpg" is available in "jpg" format from

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>

This figure "mixf-pics-oxma-tngb-ok-function-of-h-tg.jpg" is available in "jpg" form

<http://arxiv.org/ps/1311.4226v1>